

DRAFT – Attachment A
Minutes of the Population Technical Advisory Committee
Friday, November 17, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Arizona State University – Tom Rex
Department of Education – Robert Franciosi
Department of Economic Security – Linda Strock / Peter Kozy
Department of Health Services – Richard Porter
Department of Revenue – Rosemary Soto
Department of Transportation – Jami Garrison
Maricopa Association of Governments – Anubhav Bagley/Harry Wolfe
Pima Association of Governments – Kristen Zimmerman
Northern Arizona Council of Governments – Chris Fetzer
Central Arizona Association of Governments – Jack Tomasik
Western Arizona Council of Governments – Dave Barber
Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona – Norm Petersen
* State Land Department – Mila Hill

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Northern Arizona University
University of Arizona
Department of Commerce
Department of Water Resources
Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization
County Supervisors Association of Arizona
League of Arizona Cities & Towns
The Navajo Nation
* City of Phoenix
* Department of Environmental Quality
* Department of Insurance
* Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization

ALSO PRESENT:

Allen Barnes, Department of Economic Security
Van Braswell, Department of Economic Security
Warren Brown, Cornell University ¹
Carla Carter, Facilitator
Jim Chang, School Facilities Board
Samuel Colón, Department of Economic Security
Dennis Doby, Department of Economic Security
John Fan, Department of Economic Security
Susan Kanzler, Department of Economic Security
Jeff Romine, Maricopa Association of Governments

¹ Participating by teleconference

* Non-voting member

1. Call to Order.

Chairman Richard Porter called the meeting to order at 10:35 am.

2. Approval of Minutes of Prior POPTAC Meeting.

Richard Porter asked for comments or corrections of the minutes from the prior meeting and called for a motion to approve the minutes. Anubhav Bagley asked that the minutes be amended to show that under projections, discussion occurred regarding Metropolitan Planning Areas and annexations, and that MAG also thanked DES for re-running the Maricopa County projections based on the Special Census Survey results and that MAG plans to use the new county projections for their sub-county projections.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Harry Wolfe and seconded by Jami Garrison. The motion carried.

3. New business/Call to the Audience.

No new business.

4. Update on Evaluation Activities by Dr. Warren Brown.

Warren Brown had distributed a memo regarding the status of work on “2006 Popstats Tasking Priorities” and outlined some of the issues of working with historical data. DES maintained only the adjusted data used in preparing the 1990s estimates and many agencies that are sources of the data do not maintain historical records. Therefore, no comprehensive source of historical data is available. He emphasized the importance of capturing quality data during this decade for evaluation purposes in 2010.

Several members asked questions regarding the use of various methods, common practices for averaging methods and possible options for updating data elements such as vacancy rate and persons per household. Dr. Brown agreed that several options for improving the estimates might be worthy of investigation and emphasized that the current course of action should be to make sure we are using quality inputs, rigorously follow the methods and ensure that the data and methods are open and available for review by POPTAC and the COGs.

5. Draft 2006 Composite Estimates

Jack Tomasik expressed concern over the magnitude of the difference between the HUM and Composite Method for Pinal County and his lack of confidence in the Composite Method. He suggested some options for dealing with the issue, such as 1) putting a ceiling on the percent difference between HUM and Composite, 2) using an average of HUM and Composite for the state estimate and controlling the county HUM estimates to a state control, or 3) create a Maricopa/Pinal county model and share down the individual county estimates based on HUM.

Anubhav Bagley asked if the Medicare data had changed since last year. Samuel explained that the data used in the 2005 estimates was preliminary and the data available at this time is final.

Warren Brown explained that the MVD data has been adjusted similar to last year to account for two breaks in series and the purging of old records in the database.

Discussion followed about other counties with a large difference between HUM and Composite such as Apache and Navajo, and possible alternatives to the current methods such as adjusting the weighted average or using an independent data source like IRS migration data as an adjustment factor.

6. Draft 2006 Housing Unit Method Estimates

Pete Kozy distributed an outline of the population estimates process and where we are today. He explained that the data validation process is complete for most areas, but additional information is needed from a few areas and the HUM inputs could still change in some instances. Linda Strock explained that the additional efforts to improve the accuracy of the input data require additional time and resources that will extend the process beyond December 15th.

After additional discussion of the suggested options for improving the estimates, Tom Rex suggested that DES complete a set of preliminary estimates based on the current data and methods in order to meet its statutory deadline. Dr. Brown, with assistance from DES and POPTAC members, could work on any analyses that could be forwarded to the Economic Estimates Commission early in 2007, prior to the final determination of the expenditure limitations.

7. Status of 2006-2055 Sub-county Projections

Susan Kanzler gave a brief update on the progress of the sub-county projections. Pete Kozy advised everyone that Susan has accepted a promotional opportunity with the Arizona Department of Transportation effective December 4th. The members recognized Susan for her efforts in the recently approved county population projections.

8. Meeting Summary/Evaluation

Carla Carter distributed an evaluation form for the meeting and asked members to complete the evaluation.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00 noon by Richard Porter.